

IN THE UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Lashonda Mathis,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Penland Automotive, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. _____

**PLAINTIFF'S ANSWERS TO LOCAL CIVIL RULE 26.01
INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiff, Lashonda Mathis, by and through the undersigned counsel, responds to District of South Carolina Local Civil Rule 26.01 Interrogatories, as follows:

- A. State the full name, address and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of same interest.

RESPONSE: None known at this time.

- B. As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or non-jury and why.

RESPONSE: Plaintiff's claims should be tried by jury. Plaintiff's causes of action are actions at law which are tried by a jury under controlling law.

- C. State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly owned company and separately identify: (1) each publicly owned company of which it is a parent, subsidiary, partner, or affiliate; (2) each publicly owned company which owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares or other indicia or ownership of the party; and (3) each publicly owned company in which the party owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares.

RESPONSE: Plaintiff is an individual.

D. State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division).

RESPONSE: This action was filed to the United States District Court, Division of Greenville, by Plaintiff Lashonda Mathis.

E. Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in this District, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide: (1) a short caption and the full case number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters are related; and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which may be related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases are related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases: arise from the same or identical transaction, happenings or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

RESPONSE: None.

DAVE MAXFIELD, ATTORNEY, LLC

s/ David A. Maxfield
David A. Maxfield, Fed ID 6293
5217 N. Trenholm Rd., Ste. B
Columbia, SC 29206
(803) 509-6800
Attorney for Plaintiff Lashonda Mathis

DATED: November 13, 2017

Greenwood, South Carolina